



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,317	12/20/2005	John Stark	P/1336-201	2795
2352	7590	05/19/2011	EXAMINER	
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN			WEINSTEIN, LEONARD J	
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 100368403			3746	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/19/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/561,317	Applicant(s) STARK, JOHN
	Examiner LEONARD WEINSTEIN	Art Unit 3746

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) LEONARD WEINSTEIN. (3)_____.

(2) MICHAEL MARKOWITZ. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 18 May 2011.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 9, 15, 18 and 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Leonard J Weinstein/
Examiner, Art Unit 3746

/Devon C Kramer/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3746

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135 (35 U.S.C. 132).

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed,
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant requested clarification regarding the issues raised in sections 6, 9.b, 10, 12, and 13 of the Office Action of February 18, 2011 ("02/2011 Office Action").

With respect to section 6, the examiner noted to be in condition for allowance, an amendment to claim 18 was needed that claimed that if a hole size is within the range of 50-500 μm then "silent suction" and the prevention of "reducing the suction capacity," is achieved. Currently the claim separates these benefits and claims a hole size near 50 μm yields silent suction and a hole size near 500 μm prevents the reduction of suction capacity. As noted in the 02/2011 Office Action, the instant specification does not attribute one benefit to one portion of the range and the other benefit to the other portion of the range. 02/2011 Office Action pg. 3-4. The applicant proposed the following amendment to claim 18. The limitations:

"the range of hole sizes being configured to provide relatively silent suction of the fluid without reducing the suction capacity, the 500 μm upper bound of hole sized being configured to prevent interference with the continuous geometry of the double-cone device so as to provide relatively silent suction of the fluid and the 50 μm lower bound of hole size being configured to prevent reduction of the suction capacity"

will be amended to recite:

"the range of hole sizes being configured to prevent interference with the continuous geometry of the double-cone device so as to provide relatively silent suction of a material and prevent reduction of the suction capacity"

The examiner noted that the proposed amendment appeared to overcome the rejection of claim 18 set forth in sections 6 and 9.b of the 02/2011 Office Action. 02/2011 Office Action, pg. 3-6. The applicant directed the examiner's attention to page 12 of the Amendment of October 12, 2010 as reference in support of this amendment.

With respect to section 9.b the applicant proposes that the limitation of "the fluid" in line 9 of each claim be amended to recite "a material." The examiner noted that this appeared to obviate the rejection of claims 9, 18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph in section 9.b of the 02/2011 Office Action. 02/2011 Office Action, pg. 5. The examiner notes that the rejection in section 9.b applies to each of claims 9, 18, and 22 as that section states "[t]he limitation of 'the fluid' in line 9 of each claim" and applies to the claims listed in section 9. 02/2011 Office Action, pg. 3-5, section 9 and 9.b. The applicant noted that in a response to the 02/2011 Office Action, the portion of the specification that supports this amendment will be cited.

With respect to section 10, the applicant inquired whether incorporating the limitations as best understood by the examiner would be sufficient to put the claim in condition for allowance. 02/2011 Office Action, pg. 3-7. The examiner replied in the affirmative but notes that claim 16 will only be in condition for allowance if claim 9 is amended to overcome the rejections in the 02/2011 Office Action. 02/2011 Office Action, pg. 4-6.

With respect to section 12, the examiner confirmed that the listing of claim 18 in the opening sentence of the section was intended to be claim 22. 02/2011 Office Action, pg. 8.

With respect to section 13, the examiner confirmed that the listing of claims in the section should have included claim 16. 02/2011 Office Action, pg. 9.